

Enclosure 1

~~SECRET~~
24 September 1957

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, Shipbuilding Subcommittee, EIC
THROUGH : Chief, Collection Staff, SI
FROM : Acting Chief, Applied Science Division, SI
SUBJECT : Soviet Long Term Exchange Proposal
REFERENCE : (a) Shipbuilding Subcommittee of EIC memorandum
to Chairman IAC Standing Committee on
Exchanges dated 2 July 1956
(b) Secretary, IAC Ad Hoc Committee on Exchanges
memorandum to Chairman, Subcommittee on
Shipbuilding of EIC dated 18 September 1957

1. The enclosure to reference (a) was a report entitled "Review of [REDACTED] Aspects of Exchange With the USSR in the Field of Shipbuilding". This review considered the [REDACTED] aspects from two points of view; namely, Theoretical Shipbuilding and Practical Shipbuilding. The part dealing with Theoretical Shipbuilding, which was prepared in the Applied Science Division, SI, concluded that [REDACTED] gain to the U.S. would result from an exchange and contained a suggested program for an exchange. 25X1X1
25X1X1

2. Reference (b) forwarded a copy of the recent request of the Soviet Ambassador to the State Department for cooperation in the arrangement of long term (3 to 6 months) exchanges in certain fields. Reference (b) further requests a re-assessment of the possibilities of intelligence gain in the field of shipbuilding which might result from a long term exchange such as proposed by the Soviet Ambassador.

3. For the reasons set forth below, it is the opinion of this Division that a net [REDACTED] gain to the U.S. would not accrue from a long term exchange in the field of theoretical shipbuilding and we recommend that no new program for such an exchange (long or short term) be promoted at this time. 25X1X1

4. A long term exchange on the subject of the theoretical and experimental aspects of research and development in shipbuilding might logically consist of:

S- E-C-R-E-T

a. An exchange of students at universities where naval architecture and marine engineering are taught with reciprocal privileges of studying certain subjects at those universities.

b. A very complete sight-seeing tour of many of the research and development establishments connected with naval architecture and marine engineering in the respective countries spending perhaps two or three days at each.

c. An exchange of research scientists between research establishments involving reciprocal opportunities to study the experimental techniques used in the respective establishments.

5. Because of the immensely more thorough Soviet security measures as compared with U.S. measures, any extended stay in the Soviet Union by our representatives will present much less opportunity to obtain [REDACTED] than would a similar stay in the U.S. by Soviet representatives. For instance, a Soviet student taking a course at M.I.T., though he would not be shown any classified material, would, however, in a 3 to 6 months period be apt to over-hear information of value unless extraordinary measures were taken to isolate and identify him. It is believed that the converse would not obtain to anywhere near the same extent for an American student in a Soviet university. What we would consider extraordinary measures to isolate and identify him would be taken by the Soviets as a matter of course.

25X1X1

6. An extended stay of a Soviet research scientist at any important American research facility handling classified projects is unthinkable and it is believed that the Soviets would take the same view. An exchange in this category would be limited by the security considerations of both countries to such an extent that there would be no significant opportunity to obtain intelligence.

7. Reciprocal short visits to a long series of research establishments known to be concerned with naval architectural and marine engineering research would provide an opportunity to become better acquainted with Soviet research facilities and the Soviets would not learn much more than they already can obtain from open literature about American facilities. This does not seem sufficiently valuable, however, to warrant the establishment of a special delegation of research scientists to undertake it. If an exchange in the field of practical shipbuilding is undertaken it would not be inappropriate to suggest that reciprocal visits to some research institutes be included on their itineraries. A list of Soviet and similar American institutes is contained in the Theoretical Shipbuilding part of the enclosure to reference (a). It should be noted here that this list does not include the Soviet

S-E-C-R-E-T

research institute which would probably be of primary importance to practical shipbuilders; namely, the Central Scientific Research Institute of the Technology of Shipbuilding believed to be located in Leningrad.

8. It might reasonably be proposed at this point that the long term exchange of the Soviets be countered with a suggestion of a short term exchange in theoretical shipbuilding as proposed in the enclosure to reference (a). Because of recent developments, however, this does not seem appropriate at this time. In the first place, the theoretical shipbuilding exchange was substantively set in the field of research and development on the seaworthiness of ships. Since the time of that proposal, the Soviets have published an important paper on the motions of ships in confused seas which indicates a good deal about their status in this work. Furthermore, the authors of this work were from the Soviet Scientific Research Institute No. 45 which is parallel to the U.S. Navy's David Taylor Model Basin. One of the primary aims of the original proposal was to obtain information on the new model basin of the TSMII 45. In May of this year a Finnish naval architect in connection with a Fenno-Soviet exchange was taken through this facility and has provided information on the facilities there. A requirement has been served, but not yet answered, to obtain additional information from him. Beside these developments, the Soviets in the current month have sent delegates to two European international conferences on seaworthiness, one in the Netherlands and one in Spain, at which competent American observers are also present. The extent of Soviet disclosures at these conferences is not yet known. It is clear, however, that it would be inappropriate to suggest a unilateral Soviet-American exchange in this field at this time.

9. In view of the rather extensive opening-up of Soviet technical literature which has occurred since the preparation of the exchange proposal in Theoretical Shipbuilding, together with the recent Soviet voluntary participation in international conferences, it does not now seem worthwhile to expend the effort to promote exchanges for intelligence purposes in the field of research and development in naval architecture and marine engineering. Such exchanges can furnish only unclassified type of information. Up until the beginning of 1957 it appeared that even to get this kind of information on Soviet activities some sort of operation like an exchange would be valuable, but the present situation does not appear to justify such an exchange.

25X1A9a



1